DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 035 SO 010 510

AUTHOR Remy, Richard C.
TITLE Social Studies and Citizenship Education.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Mershon Center.
PUB DATE Nov 77
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Cincinnati, Ohio, November 23-26, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Business Responsibility; Change Strategies; Church Responsibility; *Citizenship; Citizenship Responsibility; *Civics; *Continuous Learning; Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; *Definitions; Educational Alternatives; *Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Educational Objectives; Educational Responsibility; Elementary Secondary Education; Government Role; Higher Education; Religious Organizations; Social Organizations; Social Responsibility; *Social Studies

ABSTRACT

This paper outlines a new way of defining the scope and domain of citizen education within the social studies curriculum. It is intended to help educators better attain their particular goals and expand their vision of citizenship education. The paper is divided into three parts. Part I emphasizes that the narrow, traditional definition of the scope and domain of citizenship education keeps it totally within the schools; little attention is paid to the development of programs outside the school. Part II examines some weaknesses in the current definition: citizenship education is not treated as a cumulative, lifelong process; the development of citizen competence with problem solving is neglected; there are limitations on the school's capacity to contribute to citizenship education; and the field's current focus on schooling unnecessarily restricts the capacity of social studies educators from experimenting with a full range of methods and instructional theories available to them. Part III redefines the field's interest in citizenship education as follows: social studies education has an interest in educating citizens of all ages by undertaking educational activities in each of the sectors involved in citizenship education. These sectors include schools; local, state, and national government; business; labor; mass media; and primary, voluntary, and religious organizations. The requirements and conditions for expanding the concept of citizenship education are also outlined. (Author/JK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED150035

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard C. Remy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Social Studies and Citizenship Education

by

Richard C. Remy
Mershon Center
Ohio State University

Presented at

College and University Faculty Assembly General Session
National Council for the Social Studies
Annual Meeting, Cincinnati, 1977

SP 010 510

Social Studies and Citizenship Education

I. Our Present Relationship to Citizenship Education

The Current Definition of Interest
- Curriculum Development
- Teaching
- Research

II. An Evaluation of Our Current Definition

III. A Redefinition of the Field's Interest in Citizenship Education

Scope and Domain of the Field's Interest

New Professional Activities

Requirements for Expanding the Field's Involvement
- A Support System
- Identifying Others
- Building Collaborative Relationships

Conclusion

Social Studies and Citizenship Education

Richard C. Remy
Mershon Center
Ohio State University

What should be the relationship between social studies education and citizenship education? How we define the scope of our interests in citizenship education affects the way we organize ourselves to work on citizenship education as classroom instructors, curriculum developers, researchers and managers of professional development activities.

This paper presents a new frame of reference or way of defining the scope of our interests in citizenship education. This new frame of reference is *not* intended to resolve long-standing disputes in the field over which attributes are most important to good citizenship or what good citizenship means. Rather, it is intended to help us stretch or expand our vision of how we can professionally relate to citizenship education. In so doing, it can help social studies educators, whatever their specific approach, better attain their own particular goals in citizenship education. It can also have practical benefits for the field in the face of declining enrollments in education courses at the college and university level.

The paper is divided into three parts. Part I briefly summarizes how we have traditionally defined the scope and domain of our interest in citizenship education. Part II evaluates this definition in light of social science based knowledge about the processs of citizenship education today. Part III outlines a new frame of reference or way of defining the scope and domain of our interest in citizenship education.

The author wishes to thank John Patrick, Indiana University, and Richard C. Snyder, Mershon Center, for their very helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

I. Our Present Relationship to Citizenship Education

A majority of social studies educators today would likely agree that the primary concern of social studies is *citizenship education*. This is evidenced in several ways. Leaders within the field have pointed to citizenship education as the "centering concept" of social studies.[1] A review of the evolution of the field recently concluded that, "there is now general agreement that the primary, overriding purpose of the social studies is citizenship education."[2] In addition, the Board of Directors of the National Council for the Social Studies has called for social studies to be defined and presented in terms of citizenship education, and for special efforts to be made by the Council to improve citizenship education.[3] Finally, even cursory examination of social studies instructional materials and curriculum guidelines indicates that almost without exception they find their ultimate justification in the development of competent citizens committed to democratic values.

Citizenship education involves learning and instructing directed to the development of citizen competence.[4] It is concerned with factors pertinent to the governance of social groups to which people belong. The end results of citizenship education are evident when the citizen faces the task of deciding for whom to vote in a mayoral election. Or when citizens need to acquire information about zoning regulations in their community. Or when the citizen seeks to influence the decision of a government agency.

Citizen competence is a relational concept characterizing the quality of a person's participation in processes associated with group governance such as making or influencing decisions, providing leadership, or acquiring information. Experience tells us that some people are more competent as citizens than others. Competence with citizenship involves

a multi-dimensional amalgam of knowledge, skills, attitudes and experiences. These attributes are generally identifiable but uniquely configured in each individual.[5]

How have we traditionally defined the nature and scope of our interest in the process of citizenship education? What facets of this process have been of special concern to us as social studies educators? What kinds of research, development and teaching activities related to citizenship education do we currently undertake?

The Current Definition of Interest

As things stand, social studies education equates citizenship education with schools and schooling. That is, the formal and informal educational processes related to citizen development that occur in elementary and high schools are the focal point of the field's concern. Within schools the "social studies curriculum"--a particular sequence of courses and subject matter from kindergarten through high school--is the prime interest of most social studies educators.

Over the years this definition has come to set the boundaries for what we consider legimitate or normal professional activities within the social studies field. Of course, as is the case with any field, there is considerable debate about specific problems, concepts and methodologies *within* the prevailing definition of the field. For example, Barr, Barth and Shermis describe three competing traditions within social studies each designed to promote good citizenship education.[6] However, the boundaries of the field of social studies itself are hardly ever questioned. Rather, all the major intellectual and professional activities of the field are defined in reference to elementary and high schools. Let us briefly consider these activities.

Curriculum Development. Social studies educators develop new instructional materials for use in schools. They design and outline school curriculum patterns in the social studies area. And they theorize about the structure of the curriculum and about alternative instructional approaches. Over the years social studies educators have advanced a variety of philosophical positions regarding the curriculum and they have created a truly rich array of materials for use by teachers and students in elementary and high schools.[7] Little or no attention, however, has been given to the development of educational programs or activities outside of the schools.

Teaching. Social studies educators train teachers and school administrators to implement the K-12 social studies curriculum. This training occurs within a framework of local and state certification requirements for educational personnel. Social studies educators also train graduate students to be like themselves and carry on the field. A host of professional activities are associated with the teaching function including the design of pre- and in-service workshops, participation in the establishment of certitifcation requirements, the preparation of teaching methods, textbooks and the like. Little or no attention, however, has been given to the preparation of people for other educational roles in society related to citizenship education.

Research. Social studies educators conduct research on the effectiveness of their development and teaching activities, on conditions relating to the process of citizenship education in schools and on the diffusion of innovations within schools.[8] A comprehensive review of recent research in the field equates social studies education with schooling and identifies "the school as the most important locale for educational research" in the

future.[9] Little or no attention, however, has been given to analyzing the complex interactions of school and non-school agents in the process of citizen development.

To summarize: Social studies educators have directed their professional activities to the various processes associated with citizenship education in elementary and high schools. This reflects their definition of the nature and scope of the discipline's interest in citizenship education.

II. An Evaluation of the Current Definition

How adequate is this way of defining the scope and domain of our interests in citizenship education? Do our present curriculum development, teaching and research activities adequately reflect or take into account what we know about citizenship education today?

In light of social science research on political learning, there would appear to be several important weaknesses in the way we currently define the scope and domain of our interest in citizenship education.[10] These are:

1. Citizenship education is not treated as a society-wide process shared by all the institutions of society.
2. Limitations on the school's capacity to contribute to citizenship education are not adequately accounted for.
3. The development of citizen competence with problem-solving in the social process is neglected.
4. Citizenship education is not treated as a cumulative, life-long process.
5. The multi-method requirements of citizenship education are not fully accounted for.

Consideration of these shortcomings can alert us to the consequences of our current approach for citizenship education and for the social studies field . Looked at another way, assertions about shortcomings in our current approach provide criteria for what we need to do in the future. Let us consider these assertions in detail.

1. Citizenship education is not treated as a society-wide process shared by all the institutions of society.

Who is involved in citizenship education? Our focus has been on K-12 schools and schooling. Yet we know that citizenship education is not confined to elementary and high schools. Rather, the task of advancing citizen competence is embedded in a rich institutional context that involves all other major social institutions in one way or another.

In addition to the schools, at least seven other non-school shaping forces and arenas share in the process of citizenship education. These are governmental institutions, business and labor, the mass-media, voluntary organizations, religious organizations and primary groups (the family and peer groups).[11] These shaping forces perform several functions in the process of citizen development which involve both formal education and informal learning in institutional and non-institutional settings. We will not develop these distinctions here. Rather it is sufficient to note that these sectors act both as settings where individuals confront daily the tasks of citizenship and as sources of the knowledge, skills, attitudes and experiences we acquire through citizenship education. Each is a stake-holder in the process in the sense that they have something to gain or lose from the outcomes of citizenship education.

Government. Government institutions at local, state and national levels engage in citizenship education. By their structure and performance governments can shape citizen competence.[12] In addition, the official mission of many government agencies is educating citizens about their area of concern and the services they provide. Further, the Department of Defense carries out educational programs on socio-political/military topics for both their own personnel and for the public.

Business and Labor. Private enterprise and the labor movement have a stake in citizenship education.[13] Both strive to educate their own personnel as well as segments of the public as to their position on issues like right-to-work laws or the oil depletion allowance. Further, the business sector has an interest in promoting education about the free enterprise system and works with various public and private agencies to that end. Many labor unions, in turn, provide leadership training activities for their own rank and file.

Voluntary Affiliations. Many voluntary organizations and community groups such as the YMCA, scouting programs and ethnic associations have their own educational programs--some directly related to citizenship education. For example, the League of Women Voters is periodically an important source of information on election candidates and issues for millions of citizens. In addition, voluntary organizations may facilitate citizen participation in community civic life. Further, these organizations are a training ground for the exercise of citizenship skills--particularly those related to advocacy and participation.[14] Local dramatic societies, sports clubs, political parties and groups, learned societies, chambers of commerce and consumer groups all face problems of group governance. Their members have to make decisions and policy, establish rules, allocate scarce resources and set goals.

Religious Organizations. At least weekly millions of religious followers gather in their places of worship to listen to messages about values and right conduct.[15] Organized religions can have a profound effect on the value formation and moral education of their followers. In addition, many religious organizations today are concerned with helping their members better relate their religious beliefs to current social problems. As a result the various faiths offer educational programs

intended for both children and adults. These programs may seek to enhance ethical decision-making skills for political and economic action, or to build awareness of issues like racism or to enlist individuals as volunteers in programs related to the civic life of the community.

Mass-Media. The mass-media--television, radio, newspapers, magazines--are an important source of citizenship education.[16] Citizens young and old gather factual information about politics and have their attitudes and values shaped by exposures to the mass media. The most potent and clearly most controversial of the mass-media is commercial television. It influences values, myths and beliefs we hold about our society. In addition, commercial television spreads selected information about political events and issues such as an oil embargo, brush-fire war or assassination very quickly. And in the absence of competing information it is difficult for most citizens to dispute what has seemingly occurred before their eyes.

Primary Groups. The family and peer groups also play an important role in the task of citizenship education.[17] Parents pass on political orientations to their children directly and indirectly. The family influences the young child's exposure to other agents of citizenship education. The friends we have, the schools we attend and the recreational groups we join are largely determined by the family. Peer groups exert an increasing influence on children as they mature and their influence continues to be part of the process of citizen development throughout life. As we age their form changes to include marriage (husband-wife pairs), work and professional colleagues, neighbors and relations developed among people in social and religious organizations.

Each of the shaping forces we have considered--government, business and labor, the mass-media, voluntary organizations, religious organizations

and primary groups--contribute to the process of citizenship education in its own way. Taken together, these sectors, along with the schools, represent the institutional ecology of citizenship education today.

How adequate is the current definition of our interest in citizenship education when measured against the society-wide nature of the process? It would appear the field's current definition fails completely to take this critical factor into account. Instead, it focuses exclusively upon only one of the agents involved in the process--the schools. This isolates the social studies field from many of the key participants in the development of citizen competence. This isolation has negative consequences for non-school agents of citizenship education, for the schools and for the field of social studies education.

The non-school agents of citizenship education suffer because they are deprived of the knowledge, materials and educational expertise available in social studies education today. This pool of intellectual resources has the potential for strengthening non-school based citizenship education.

The schools suffer because isolation from other sectors limits our ability to understand the non-school factors affecting school-based learning. Further, it greatly restricts the capacity of practitioners in the social studies field to better coordinate their work in the schools with non-school efforts in citizenship education.

Finally, the field of social studies education suffers because we are cut off from a large number of potential clients for our services. Hence, we are not taking advantage of an opportunity for new work, new financial resources and challenging new intellectual problems at a time when the field badly needs an infusion of all these elements. In addition, social

studies educators have an interest in generating new knowledge about the process of citizenship education and in expediting the application of such knowledge to specific educational problems. Our isolation from non-school citizenship education substantially reduces the capacity of the field to produce new knowledge about a very significant dimension of the process through which people develop as citizens. In turn, lack of knowledge regarding non-school citizenship education restricts our capacity to develop innovative educational programs that build upon the natural interaction between classroom, school, home and community in the process of citizenship education.

2. Limitations on the schools' capacity to contribute to citizenship education are not adequately accounted for.

By historical tradition and legal mandate schools have occupied a prominent role in citizenship education and they will probably continue to do so. However, the capacity of the schools to contribute to citizenship education is limited in at least two ways. First, there is a finite amount of curriculum space available for citizenship education and the ability of the schools to integrate various curriculum offerings is limited. Second, schools may be more appropriate for some types of learning and instructing than for others.

Equating our interest in citizenship education with K-12 schooling has greatly hindered the ability of social studies education to come to terms with the limitations of the schools. Over the years as the complexity of citizenship has increased social studies educators have developed a great variety of new approaches to citizenship education. These include global education, moral education, law related education, multi-cultural education, career education, consumer education, environmental education, values education, community involvement, psychology, sociology and economics.

Many of the ideas in these new approaches are intrinsically valuable. However, our total preoccupation with K-12 formal schooling has meant that we have attempted to load all new contributions to citizenship education on the schools whether they really belonged there or not. Thus, most of these contributions are structured as discrete entities aimed at specific niches in the elementary or high school curriculum much like ice-cubes in a tray. Curriculum "change" comes about when one cube is removed to be replaced by another.

Because of the already crowded school agenda the new contributions to citizenship education must compete with each other and with the more traditional history, geography and government for a share of the social studies curriculum "turf." This creates an either-or situation. *Either* there is room for law-focused education, for instance, in the curriculum *or* there is room for one or more of its competitors, but there is not room for all.

The result is that given the current structure of American schools--a structure not likely to change--it is almost impossible to integrate all these discrete new contributions into the curriculum and hence *into the citizen's education.* Thus, the citizen's education is being continually fragmented into smaller and more specialized segments that bear little relationship to the actual tasks of citizenship people have to cope with in everyday life.

In addition, our focus on K-12 schooling has meant that as we develop new contributions to citizenship education we rarely, if ever, question whether the schools are the most appropriate institutional vehicle for our contribution. Yet socialization research clearly indicates that the different agents of citizenship education vary in their appropriateness

for teaching particular kinds of knowledge, skills and attitudes or for providing participation experiences. Schools, for instance, may be a more efficient vehicle for teaching facts about constitutional processes than families and peer groups. Whereas families and peer groups are likely to be strong forces in shaping basic identities and values. Further, the sectors vary in their susceptibility to planned interventions in the process of citizenship education. It may, for example, be more difficult to diffuse an educational innovation among millions of elementtary school teachers than among a small number of labor union officials. Unfortunately, our preoccupation with the schools in citizenship education has prevented us from thinking systematically about the strengths and weaknesses of the schools as compared to the other agents of citizenship education.

3. The development of citizen competence with problem-solving in the social process is neglected.

We have seen that citizen competence is a multi-dimensional concept. One dimension involves solving problems, making plans, taking action in the social process. This dimension of citizen competence is concerned with *actually* impacting or influencing specific social or political problems affecting oneself. It includes reflection and understanding but it also involves active behavior in the sense of attempts to manipulate phenomena in the environment external to oneself.[18] It is not the only dimension of citizen competence but it is an important one.

The goal of advancing this aspect of citizen competence, like other goals in citizenship education, involves teaching varying combinations of knowledge, skills, attitudes and participation experiences. But it is distinct in its concern for configuring these attributes in ways relevant to a specific issue or problem confronting a group of citizens.

For example, a social studies unit on the problems of bureaucracy using case-studies of welfare agencies is not designed to promote problem-solving in the sense meant here. And it may or may not actually enhance students' ability to influence a welfare agency if they have to. On the other hand, an educational program designed to teach welfare recipients how to secure benefits from their state welfare agency is designed to promote their problem-solving competence in the social process.

By limiting the scope of the field's interest to the schools, we have greatly restricted our capacity to pursue this goal in citizenship education. For schools are not necessarily the best place to teach people how to try to influence or in some way impact specific problems they confront. Schools are spatially and temporarily removed from those institutional sectors in the social process where such problems are often encountered. Further, it is impossible for school-based educators to accurately predict the specific problems or issue students will face in the future. Also, time spent on this goal would be time taken away from pursuing other important objectives in citizenship education more amenable to the schools' particular capabilities and responsibilities. Finally, pursuit of this objective could be politically risky for schools and could bring them into conflict with the community.

4. Citizenship education is not treated as a cumulative, life-long process.

The learning that results from citizenship education begins early in life and continues throughout life. This learning is cumulative in the sense that it builds on itself to produce at any point in time, the individual's particular level of citizenship competence. Thus, what a person learns about the social world at one age is influenced by what they have previously learned. For instance, what youngsters learn about elections at age fifteen is grounded in and shaped by what was learned at

age twelve. In turn, learning at age twelve is conditioned by earlier learning. This process does not end with high school or college graduation but continues throughout our adult life.

We learn different things at different phases in the continual process of citizenship education. Because of evolving cognitive/intellectual capacities and opportunities for learning, certain times in our lives will be more suitable to learning particular knowledge, skills and attitudes than other times. For example, early childhood is a time when we acquire basic political attachments and identifications. Late adolescense and adulthood, on the other hand, are times when we are more likely to learn about specific issues and actions associated with day-to-day political conflict as well as times to sharpen political skills and motivations.[19]

Thus, citizenship education does not stop at grade twelve but occurs throughout life. Many of the non-school agents of citizenship education are concerned with adult education in one form or another. The field's current focus on elementary and high schools does not adequately recognize the life-long nature of citizen development. As a result, it cuts us off from an important slice of the citizenship education process. It also cuts social studies education off from a potentially large body of new students. The average age of the population is increasing and a growing number of adults are interested in college and university-based adult education programs. Social studies educators could provide these new students with many educational services at a time when pre-service teacher education enrollments are declining rapidly.

5. The multi-method requirements of citizenship education are not fully accounted for.

Citizenship education involves more than social studies courses in school combined with patriotic rituals and rhetoric. Research on political socialization and human development clearly indicate that citizenship

education involves complex processes of human learning and development. These processes include the cognitive, the moral, the social and the emotional growth of people.

Thus different kinds of learning are involved in the process of citizen development. Instructional theorists have hypothesized that different types of learning require different instructional procedures.[20] The field's current focus on schooling unnecessarily restricts the capacity of social studies educators to pursue a multi-method approach to citizenship education. A focus on K-12 schooling automatically places psychological and social restraints on the variety of instructional approaches educators can use to promote citizen competence. For example, the very real institutional constraints involved in designing K-12 curriculum that requires field-trips or out-of-school activities are well-known to curriculum developers.

Such restraints do not completely prohibit the use of instructional variety in classroom settings as the use of role-playing, simulations, inquiry techniques and the like demonstrate. But the restraints associated with working with children and adolescents in the institutional setting of the school do inhibit social studies educators from experimenting with the full range of methods and instructional theories available to them. Further, it prevents us from trying and evaluating time-honored instructional approaches in new learning settings. As a result it inhibits the field's capacity to improve and refine these approaches.

To summarize: Social studies education has defined the scope of its interest in citizenship education very narrowly. The field has focused on only one dimension of the total process of contemporary citizenship education. This narrow focus on K-12 schools and schooling has negative consequences for social studies education. It restricts the capacity of

the profession to produce new knowledge about citizenship education. It hinders the ability of the profession to develop and evaluate imaginative, new instructional programs. And it links the profession to one shaping force or sector of limited significance in the over-all process of citizenship education. In so doing it limits the capacity of the field to achieve its proclaimed goal of improving citizenship education.

III. A Redefinition of the Field's Interest in Citizenship Education

Let us assume there is a need, or at least a real opportunity, to redefine the scope of the field's involvement in citizenship education. Let us also assume that our purpose is to help social studies education better achieve its overarching goal of developing competent citizens. How should we redefine the nature and scope of the field's interest in the process of citizenship education? What are the implications of redefinition for research, development and teaching activities in the field of social studies education?

Scope and Domain of the Field's Interest

Social studies education should no longer be equated *only* with schooling, the preparation of teachers, and the development of K-12 curriculum. Rather, the field should be concerned with the total institutional ecology of citizenship education today. Further, it should recognize the continuing, life-long nature of the process of citizen development.

In short, the nature and scope of the field's interest in citizenship education should be redefined as follows: *Social studies education has an interest in educating citizens of all ages by undertaking educational activities in each of the sectors involved in citizenship education today. These sectors are taken to include not only schools but* also local, state and national government, business and labor, the mass-

media, primary groups, voluntary organizations, and religious organizations. Social studies educators should have "clients" and on-going research, development and teaching programs related to these settings just as they currently work with teachers, students, school administrators, and others associated with the educational institutions of our society.

Social studies educators, for example, could work with a labor union to develop an instructional program for its members on the impact of federal energy programs on job security. Or they might work with a YMCA in developing a new citizenship education program focused on decision-making skills in everyday life. Or they might help a community organization prepare a series of consumer education programs for its members. Yet other social studies educators could develop a special interest in working with a municipal court to design instructional programs for citizens who find themselves embroiled with the legal system for one reason or another.

Redefining the scope of the field's interest in citizenship education does not change the overarching purpose of social studies education--the development of competent citizens. In fact, it is quite consistent with recent efforts to define the social studies as "an integration of experience and knowledge concerning human relations for the purpose of citizenship education."[21]

Nor should this redefinition be taken to mean that we should no longer be concerned with the social studies curriculum in schools, teacher education or the social organization and culture of schools. It assumes many social studies educators would continue to pursue the field's time-honored concerns in these areas. Rather, it is intended to expand our stake in citizenship education to include non-school institutions and settings as well as schools.

How well does this new definition of the field's interest in the process of citizenship education respond to the shortcomings discussed earlier?

Contextuality. The definition clearly recognizes the society-wide nature of citizenship education today. It specifies that the field has an interest in the multiple contexts associated with civic education. The field's interest is taken to include all educational activities, projects and programs designed to promote citizen competence and commitment to democratic ideals.

School limitations. The definition clearly accounts for limitations on the schools. It recognizes that a central challenge for educators posed by increasing social complexity will be to devise ways to help citizenship education better transcend formal schooling.[22] As the schools reach the limits of their capacity in this area, the other agencies of society are going to have to start contributing more to the process of developing competent citizens. The constructive involvement of these agencies will have to be expanded and coordinated better with continually improving efforts in school-based citizenship education.

Problem-solving. The definition allows social studies education to more efficiently pursue the goal of teaching people how to deal with problems they face as citizens. For the development of problem-solving competence with respect to specific issues will likely be the most important objective in some non-school learning situations. For example, a community organization may want to develop an educational program to help newcomers to the community access various social and civic services effectively. An ecology organization may want to teach members how to start a paper and glass recycling operation in their community. An urban planning group may want to teach members how

to influence a zoning decision made by local authorities. A government agency may want to teach people how to take advantage of new programs to promote energy conservation.

The goal of such activities is the development of that dimension of citizenship competence we have called "environmental problem-solving." This goal has a legitimate and important place in citizenship education. We have seen that limiting the scope of the field's interest in citizenship education to K-12 schooling makes it difficult for social studies educators to pursue the goal of problem-solving competence. Re-defining our interest makes it possible to develop programs and instructional objectives related to this goal.

Longitudinal Dimension. The definition recognizes the life-long nature of citizenship education. It opens up the possiblity of developing a wide-range of activities associated with adult education.

Multi-method approach. The definition seems to meet this criteria quite well. It increases the instructional options and approaches open to social studies educators by freeing them from the institutional constraints associated with elementary and high schools and from the psychological and social constraints inherent in working with children and adolescents.

New Professional Activities

Appropriately reconceptualizing our interest in citizenship education opens up fresh dimensions of development, teaching and research roles for the field. Specifically, several new activities are possible within a redefined social studies education. They are:

1. The development of educational programs for individuals and organizations in non-school sectors of society.

2. The development of university-based adult education programs to build citizenship competence.

3. The training of personnel involved in non-school citizenship education activities.

4. Research on citizenship education in non-school settings.

5. Coordination and monitoring of citizenship education efforts involving different sectors of society.

Let us consider each category of activities in more detail.

1. <u>The development of educational programs for individuals and organizations in non-school sectors of society.</u>

Social studies educators could expand their curriculum development activities to the governmental, family, business and labor, mass-media, voluntary and religious sectors of society. The scope of the field's involvement would range from part-time assistance in planning and conceptualizing programs to the actual development of new instructional programs, projects and activities. For example, a social studies faculty might occasionally consult with a local government wishing to develop educational programs about municipal services for city residents. On the other hand, a faculty group might design and develop a complete program about the structure of state government for a veterans organization that annually sponsors a workshop on the topic for high school students.

The goals or purposes of such curriculum development activities would vary and depend on the needs of the "clients" involved. But the content of these activities would likely be of two types. The first would be content related to a particular organization or institutional sector itself. For example, educational programs describing the services offered by organizations like the League of Women Voters might be developed for such organizations. Or a program for senior citizens might explain how to efficiently use the

Medicare system. Or educational activities might be developed for community organizations like the National Neighborhood Training Institute. The Institute offers courses designed to enhance the skills of neighborhood leaders, organizers, clinic and service workers who want to be effective in neighborhood organizations.[23]

The second type of content would not focus on a particular organization itself, but deal instead with topics pertinent to a variety of objectives in civic education. An example might be a knowledge building program like one sponsored by the Dow Chemical Company. The Dow program describes for its workers the functions of the Federal government, the Congress and regulatory agencies. The program seeks to explain how politics work and how citizens can exert influence if they become active.[24] Or social studies educators might assist a local newspaper in developing a special supplement aimed at increasing reader's skills in using the paper as a source of information about community affairs.

As these examples indicate, curriculum development of this sort could have adults and/or youth as its intended audience. Such curricula might be developed at a university or college site but it would almost always be implemented in non-university, non-school settings.

2. The development of university-based adult education programs to build citizen competence.

The field could also expand its curriculum development interest to include the creation of adult education courses. Such programs could aim at building citizen competence with "generic" skills such as decision-making (e.g. decision skills for daily living). Or they could promote "environmental problem-solving" competence with regard to locally relevant issues (e.g. how to plan for and secure better youth recreation opportunities in the community).

Adult education programs could be offered with or without credit at colleges and universities. They might take an entire semester or meet only two or three times. They could aim at special audiences (e.g. youth workers, juvenile officers and social service workers) or at the general public. They might be designed and presented alone or in combination with other academic units within the university (e.g. sociologists concerned with juvenile crime). Or they might be undertaken in conjunction with an organization within the community such as a unit of local government, a voluntary organization, a corporation or a labor union.

The challenge would be to design popular and practical programs with sound conceptual underpinnings. Programs which met real needs in an interesting way would be successful, others would not. A string of successful programs would likely generate demands for additional activity of this kind. In addition, success would help social studies educators make contact with sectors of the community beyond the schools.

3. The training of personnel involved in non-school citizenship education activities.

Teacher education has long been a central concern of social studies education. This concern could be expanded to include the training of individuals in non-school organizations engaged in citizenship education efforts. Such training might take several forms.

One would be to train individuals to use and evaluate educational programs designed for their organization by social studies educators. For example, Sunday school teachers might have to be trained to implement a moral reasoning skills program developed for their church by social studies educators. This function would be similar to training teachers and school administrators to install and use a curriculum innovation.

A second activity would be to train individuals from non-school organizations to develop and evaluate their own citizenship education programs. For example, labor union staff members specializing in educational tasks might receive training on how to develop new skill-building programs. Such training might be "pre or in-service." That is, it could occur "on the job" or in undergraduate, graduate or continuing education courses within the university.

A third activity could be to increase non-school civic educator's knowledge of the field of citizenship education. This could include awareness of key issues and alternative approaches to citizenship education as well as knowledge of available school and non-school educational materials. For example, staff members of community organizations around the country might attend a workshop designed to acquaint them with school-based citizenship programs that involve students in local community activities. Or military personnel responsible for political education programs in the armed services might participate in programs designed to inform them of the citizenship training new recruits had received in elementary and high school.

4. Research on citizenship education in non-school settings.

The process of citizenship education in non-school settings has not been adequately investigated by social studies educators. Expanding the scope of our interest in citizenship education should prompt researchers to take a more active interest in this area. Significant, long-term improvements in citizenship education ultimately depend upon expanding our research effort to the total process of citizenship education, not just that segment occuring in the schools.

Research opportunities in this domain are so numerous that we will simply suggest some obviously important categories of needed research.

First, there is a pressing need for contextual mapping across the governmental, family, business and labor, mass-media, voluntary and religious sectors. We need descriptive studies which identify on-going activities, programs and projects in each of these non-school sectors. This mapping should systematically develop information regarding such questions as: Who is undertaking citizenship education efforts in non-school sectors? What is their intended audience? What are their goals? What resources do they have at their command? What educational strategies do they employ to achieve their goals?

Second, there is a need for research which systematically evaluates the effectiveness of such programs? What factors appear to be associated with success or failure in this area?

Third, there is a need to assess the relationship, if any, between efforts in school and non-school settings. What interactive effects are there? Do citizenship education efforts in different sectors reinforce or contradict each other? Is coordination among educational activities in different sectors possible or desirable?

Fourth, new research should aim at developing empirically grounded typologies of which sectors are the best carriers of which particular intervention in citizenship education at what point in the individual's development. If research indicates that it is likely we learn different things at different points in our life-cycles as citizens, one important question becomes which sectors of society are most appropriate for teaching which kinds of knowledge, skills and attitudes associated with citizenship education.

These categories of needed research are not exhaustive but merely suggestive. A rich and important array of research topics awaits social studies educators who define their research interests in terms of the total process of citizenship education.

5. Coordination and monitoring of citizenship education efforts involving different sectors of society.

Fragmentation and duplication characterize citizenship education today. A lack of coordination and communication is apparent among the array of organizations, projects and individuals interested in citizenship education. Promising efforts are seldom linked to or aware of other similar or complementary programs. As a result opportunities to effect constructive change in citizenship education are often lost, and potential and existing resources frequently remain undeveloped.

School-based citizenship education in particular has suffered from this situation. The fragmentation of the learning process coupled with the discipline's lack of knowledge about citizenship education efforts outside of schools has made it difficult to link school-based programs to learning activities in other sectors of society.

By redefining the field's interest in citizenship education broadly, some social studies educators could develop the expertise to provide leadership in the coordination of school and non-school educational programs. As experts in school-based citizenship education with a legitimate access to the schools, they could design programs which coordinate more effectively learning activities involving the schools with other sectors of society.

Further, some social studies educators might periodically monitor changes in the patterns of citizenship education across different institutional sectors. This would permit the design of alternative futures

in citizenship education capable of anticipating demographic, social, cultural and technological changes. In addition, it would help the field of social studies education function as a communication system for cross-sector and cross-program learning.

Requirements for Expanding the Field's Involvement

What is required if social studies education is to successfully expand its involvement in citizenship education? At a minimum four conditions would eventually need to be met for the field to contribute to and benefit from non-school based citizenship education. These are the development of a support system within the field for this kind of activity, the identification of others engaged in civic education, the development of norms and techniques for working with others outside the field and the schools, and empirically based conceptualization.

A support system. At a minimum the task of expanding our involvement in civic education must be seen as a legitimate professional enterprise. That is, it must be seen as an intellectually acceptable and worthwhile enterprise by leaders and trendsetters within social studies education. This will occur when such individuals see expanded involvement as beneficial to their own and the field's self-interest and as within their capability.

From this basic acceptance an institutional, intellectual and cultural support system for expanded involvement can develop over time within social studies education. Such a system would likely have two key elements. The first would be the emergence of a sub-culture within the field interested in non-school citizenship education problems. This would be a group of scholars with shared identity and concerns in the same sense that we now speak of a sub-culture of social science or values educators within the field. The second element would be a cluster of social studies departments

with an interest and organizational commitment to non-school citizenship education.

The emergence of a sub-culture would further enhance the legitimacy of the enterprise and it would provide an array of models for others to emulate. Additionally, it would help "breed" graduate students with similar interests and yield an expanding pool of instructional materials, dissertations, publications and other artifacts associated with success in the field.

Identifying Others. By definition social studies educators cannot expand the field's involvement in citizenship education alone. We must locate others already engaged or interested in civic education efforts. The challenge is to develop over time the capacity to identify who is doing what, where, how, when and why. Such continual monitoring will yield opportunities for the kinds of professional activities described above.

While this need may seem obvious, how to fulfill it is not. The world beyond schools is largely alien territory for social studies education. If we seek to locate others by simply looking for replications of school-based social studies in non-school settings, we are bound to be disappointed. Instead, we must recognize that educational activities in non-school settings may take many forms, some quite different from what we automatically associate with citizenship education.

In addition, we should be alert to opportunities arising from activities with second and third-order effects. That is, non-school activities whose manifest goal may be something other than citizenship education, but which also have latent consequences for citizenship eduation.

Building Colaborative Relationships. We must also start building working relationships with others engaged in educating citizens. This is a critical challenge if social studies education is to expand its involvement in citizenship education.

Social studies educators know how to collaborate with individuals and organizations within the educational sector of society. There are established and time-honored norms, procedures and roles to guide our interaction with the world of elementary and secondary schools. In addition, a good deal of this interaction is structured by legal requirements in the form of teacher certification laws, state-mandated curriculum outlines, regional accreditation requirements and the like.

There are no such formal or informal guidelines for helping social studies educators interact effectively with those engaged in non-school citizenship education. What models, for example, might guide the efforts of social studies educators working with a community group interested in a skill-building educational program for neighborhood leaders? What might be a useful source of norms, procedures and roles for guiding such a collaborative relationship?

The clinical approach suggests itself as a potentially useful model for university-based social studies educators wishing to expand their professional activities into non-school areas. This model is drawn from the agricultural experiment station and from health clinics such as the Mayo Clinic, the Menninger Clinic and university-related hospitals.[25] There are, as yet, no distinct and absolute counterparts of these clinical approaches in education.

In short, the clinical approach represents a particular way of configuring university-based resources to respond to practical problems. In a clinical relationship the clients (patients) and their problems determine how the configuration of knowledge resources are arranged to help them. For example, given a medical patient's symptoms, medical knowledge is reviewed to help physicians categorize the malady, thus focusing the problem to be solved. After a diagnosis is confirmed, perhaps through appropriate tests, the medical team can determine the type of treatment

required. Once administered, the treatment is evaluated for possible modification.

Richard Snyder has identified four basic properties or distinguishing characteristics of a clinical relationship. These are:

1. A clinical relationship or process occurs in a special kind of dydadic interaction deliberately created between two parties, one of whom is a helper (a) and one of whom is a helpee((B).

2. The manifest purpose of the clinical dyad is a directed and marked change in the present state of the helpee (party B)--a change from now to later which is defined as some degree of betterment.

3. The achievement of the basic purpose of the dyad invariably involves (among other elements, of course) the application or transfer of generalized or generalizable knowledge to a single instance (case).

4. The "problem" addressed by the relationship is considered to be a "live" problem, i.e., to arise from and be embedded in some natural settings, even though subsequently the problem is discovered not to be "real" or is redefined.[26]

The clinical approach represents one model of how the profession might structure collaborative relationships with others. There, of course, may be several others. The clinical approach has the merit of involving individuals and groups with educational problems as agenda-setting participants in the process of citizenship education.

Conceptualization. Howard Mehlinger has noted that a "special weakness" in the field is "the absence of powerful conceptualizations that link the various contributors to citizen education and that respond to current social concerns."[27] Successfully expanding the scope and domain of our interest in citizenship education will require us to work seriously on conceptual development. As things now stand we are certainly open to the criticism that the field is a loose collectivity of people doing a widely varying number of things under the symbol of "citizenship." Putting empirically based, systematized, generalizable conceptual content

into that symbol may be the highest order of business for social studies

Such conceptualization must go beyond efforts to "define the field" in terms of positions which are never operationalized or empirically tested. In the same vein, the acceptance or rejection of conceptualizations should not be based on personalities. Rather, serious conceptualization will require the operationalization of middle-range concepts and hypotheses about citizenship in curriculum and research designs which can be empirically verified or rejected.

This kind of theory-building is not a task which can wait while we "get on with the day-to-day business of social studies education." Indeed, it does not seem morally or professionally responsible to continue indefinitely with "traditions" or "factions" in the field which compete primarily on an ideological, personality and/or political basis. Such laissez-faire pluralism is only likely to perpetuate a situation akin to a group of doctors saying to a sick patient--"We don't know what disease is but how can we help you?" The development of clinical, helping relationships with others as well as *disciplined* research and curriculum development will be greatly enhanced by thorough and systematic conceptualization of the social, cultural and political processes of central concern to the field.

To summarize: The four conditions we have identified--legitimacy, identification of opportunities, building relationships and conceptualization--are clearly necessary conditions for expanding the field's interest in citizenship education. However, they may not be sufficient conditions for such expansion. Successfully redefining the boundaries of the field is a complicated process and many other factors could be involved. However, it may be difficult to identify these factors until efforts to implement the redefinition are actually undertaken and evaluated.

Conclusion

There is a real need and opportunity for social studies education to redefine the scope of its interest in citizenship education. The field can move beyond an interest in schools and schooling to a concern with citizenship education in all of the institutional sectors of our complex society. There is simply no question that if such a redefinition is achieved both the field of social studies education and the citizenry will benefit.

However, expanding the scope of the field's interest in the manner called for here will not be easy. There are no real precedents to follow and no ready-made captive audience. Yet, in my judgment, expanding the field's interest deserves a significant effort. The probability of success is difficult to estimate; but if we never try, the chance of success is zero.

FOOTNOTES

[1]James Shaver in Robert D. Barr, James L. Barth and S. Samuel Shermis, Defining the Social Studies (Bulletin 51, Arlington, Virginia; National Council for the Social Studies, 1977), p. 115.

[2]Ibid., pp. 67-68

[3]Jean Tilford Claugus, Report of the President to the Board of Directors and the House of Delegates of the National Council for the Social Studies, Atlanta, Georgia, November, 1975. See also, "Toward a Reconceptualization of Citizenship Education: Preliminary Report for a Conference on Citizenship Education," sponsored by the National Council for the Social Studies, March 20-21, 1976, Indianapolis, Indiana.

[4]Learning may be seen as "a relatively permanent change in competence that results from experience and which is not attributable to physical maturation." Instruction involves manipulating a learner's environment to cause changes in capability. It is "the creation of conditions that facilitate learning." John J. Patrick, "Political Socialization and Political Education in Schools," in Stanley Renshon (ed.) Handbook of Political Socialization Research (New York: The Free Press, 1977), p. 191. Patrick refers to the following as his sources for the definition of learning and instruction: Robert M. Cagne, The Conditions of Learning (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965) and Robert M. Cagne and Leslie J. Briggs, Principles of Instructional Design (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1974).

[5]There would also seem to be reasonable consensus within the field that four attributes are associated with citizenship education. These are knowledge, skills, attitudes and participation experiences. These attributes have been described as follows:

1. Knowledge about what is called in the liberal arts tradition, the human condition, including knowledge about past, present and future.
2. Skills necessary to process information.
3. Development of values and beliefs.
4. Some way of applying what has been learned in active social participation.

Barr, et. al., Defining the Social Studies, pp. 68-69.

[6]Barr, et.al. Chapter 4. See also, Dale L. Brubaker, Laurence H. Simon and Jo Watts Williams, "A Conceptual Framework for Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction," Social Education (March, 1977), pp. 201-205.

[7]John J. Patrick, "Political Socialization and Political Education in Schools," pp. 206-222.

[8]Francis P. Hunkins, et.al. Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1970-1975 (Arlington, Virginia: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977).

[9]Ibid., p. 198

[10]For recent summaries of this research see Richard E. Dawson, Kenneth Prewitt and Karen S. Dawson, Political Socialization, 2nd Edition (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1977) and Renshon, Handbook of Political Socialization Research.

[11]In human societies basic values such as enlightenment are shaped and distributed by institutions. By non-school shaping forces I have in mind both formal, complex organizations, and established and structured patterns of behavior and relationships accepted as the way of doing things in any culture. See Charles F. Hermann and Margaret G. Hermann, "Global Appraisal of Institutional Impacts," Mershon Center Quarterly Report, Volume 2:3 (Spring, 1977). The typology of sectors used in this paper is a first approximation and intended to be illustrative rather than definitive.

[12]Roberta S. Sigel, Learning About Politics: A Reader in Political Socialization (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 471 and James A. Nathan and Richard C. Remy, "Political Structure and Political Attitudes: A Cross-National Comparison," American Politics Quarterly, 4:4 (October, 1976), pp. 423-441.

[13]Howard D. Mehlinger and John J. Patrick, "The Status of Citizen Education," paper commissioned by the U.S. Office of Education - Task Force on Citizenship Education, (August, 1977).

[14]Harold Entwistle, Political Education in a Democracy (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971), p. 78.

[15]Mehlinger and Patrick, "The Status of Citizen Education," p. 41.

[16]See, for example, J.R. Dominick, "Television and Political Socialization," Educational Broadcasting Review, 6 (1972), pp. 48-56; A.M. Rubin, "Television in Children's Political Socialization," Journal of Broadcasting, 20 (Winter, 1976), pp. 51-59; R.H. Prisuta, "Mass Media Exposure and Political Behavior," Educational Broadcasting Review, 7 (June, 1973), pp. 167-173.

[17]Dawson, et.al. Political Socialization, pp. 184-85 and John J. Patrick, Political Socialization of American Youth, Research Bulletin No. 3 (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1967).

[18]For a discussion of competence see Fred M. Newmann, Education for Citizen Action (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975), Chapter 1.

[19]Robert Weissberg, Political Learning, Political Choice and Democratic Citizenship (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974), pp. 23-31.

[20]Lee Ehman, Howard Mehlinger and John Patrick, Toward Effective Instruction in Secondary Social Studies (Atlanta: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974), pp. 118-129.

[21]Barr, et.al., Defining the Social Studies, p. 69.

[22]Harold G. Shane, "America's Next 25 Years: Some Implications for Education," Phi Delta Kappan 58:1 (September, 1976), p. 80.

[23]Mehlinger and Patrick, "The Status of Citizen Education, p. 30.

[24]Ibid. p. 16

[25]Several Mershon documents describe the elements of a clinical approach: Chapter One in Rodney Muth and Larry Slonaker, "Toward a More Comprehensive Strategy for Strengthening Educational Leadership and Policy-Making: A Design for Clinical Education, Research and Service" (Mershon Center, Institutional Leadership Program, July, 1976); William Gore, Kent Redfield, and John Bolland, "Overview of a Clinical Strategy for the Facilitation of Development Program Change" (Mershon Center, August, 1976); Randall B. Ripley, Project Research and the Clinical Relationship (Columbus, Ohio: Mershon Center Position Paper in the Policy Sciences, January, 1977).

[26]Richard C. Snyder, "Some Thoughts on the Search for the Clinical," Mershon Center, September, 1974, p. 5.

[27]Howard D. Mehlinger, "How Can We Improve the Citizen Education of American Youth," mimeographed, September, 1976.